TESTIMONY OF THE CENTER FOR CHILDREN'S ADVOCACY IN OPPOSITION TO SECTIONS 1 AND 4 OF RAISED BILL NO. 1142, AN ACT CONCERNING RELIEF OF STATE MANDATES ON SCHOOL DISTRICTS

March 23, 2009

This testimony is submitted on behalf of the Center for Children's Advocacy, a non-profit organization based at the University of Connecticut School of Law. The Center provides holistic legal services for poor children in Connecticut's communities through individual representation and systemic advocacy. Through our Truancy Court Prevention Project and TeamChild Juvenile Justice Project, the Center represents children in securing appropriate educational programming and improving academic outcomes by reducing high suspension, expulsion, and dropout rates.

We strongly oppose section 1 of Raised Bill No. 1142, An Act Concerning Relief of State Mandates on School Districts, which delays implementation of the in-school suspension law until July 1, 2011. We also oppose section 4, which places the burden of proof in special education due process hearings on parents who allege that the school has failed to meet their child's unique educational needs.

I. Opposition to Section 1: Delaying Implementation of the In-School Suspension Law

a. Implementation does not Require the Creation of In-School Suspension Programs

By law, a student can be "suspended"—excluded from school privileges or transportation services for up to ten consecutive days—for conduct that violates a publicized board policy, seriously disrupts the educational process, or endangers persons or property.[1] The 2007 revisions require suspensions to be "in-school suspensions" *unless* the school administration determines that the student (1) poses such a danger to persons or property or (2) is so disruptive of the educational process, that he or she must serve the suspension outside of school.[2] Under the law, schools remain free to impose a wide range of disciplinary options, entirely within their discretion; *no school is required to create any in-school suspension program at all* if they have chosen other means of in-school discipline, such as after-school detention, Saturday detention, withdrawal of school privileges, or community service.[3]

b. Delaying Implementation Imposes Significant Educational and Economic Costs

Aside from the obvious educational costs to missing school, exclusionary discipline policies undermine a student's sense of belonging to a school community and deteriorate the personal relationships with teachers that are fundamental to academic and lifetime

---

[1] CONN. GEN. STAT. § 10-233c(a).

[2] *Id.* § 10-233c(g).

[3] For a list of alternatives to suspension, *see, e.g.*, Reece L. Peterson, *Ten Alternatives to Suspension, in* 18 IMPACT: FEATURE ISSUE ON FOSTERING SUCCESS IN SCHOOL AND BEYOND FOR STUDENTS WITH EMOTIONAL/BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS 10–11 (Vicki Gaylord et al., eds.) (Spring 2005), http://www.ici.umn.edu/products/impact/182/182.pdf.

success.[4] Repeated out-of-school suspensions may even accelerate a child's path to delinquency.[5] In 2007, Connecticut's Court Support Services Division (CSSD) reported that nine out of ten 16 and 17-year-olds in the juvenile justice system had, at one point, been excluded from school through an out-of-school suspension.[6] Discipline policies that promote prevention and early intervention are critical to giving every child an equal chance at academic and personal success. We therefore urge you to oppose this section of the bill.

II. Opposition to Section 4: Placing the Burden of Proof on Parents who Request a Special Education Due Process Hearing

Under Connecticut's existing special education regulations, if the parent or guardian of a child eligible for special education services requests a due process hearing to challenge the effectiveness of her child's IEP, the local educational agency bears the burden of proving that the academic program affords the child a free appropriate public education (FAPE).[7] This approach is consistent with the laws of other jurisdictions,[8] and has been supported by Attorney General Richard Blumenthal,[9] the former Commissioner of the Department of Education,[10] and numerous special education advocates.[11] Moreover, requiring the district to demonstrate that its plan is reasonably tailored to meet the child's individual needs may actually help avoid the administrative and litigation costs of challenges to inadequate educational programming by strengthening the school's resolve to carefully develop an appropriate IEP.[12]

a. Shifting the Burden of Proof to Parents is Inconsistent with State and Federal IDEA Regulations

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act was implemented to remedy the absence of appropriate educational programming and the lack of adequate school-based resources for millions of children with disabilities.[13] Consequently, IDEA and Connecticut regulations impose an affirmative duty on school districts to protect and promote the educational welfare of disabled children by identifying students in need of interventions and formulating their IEPs.[14] The decision to impose on the district an obligation to find and program for students eligible for special education services, and to afford these students and their parents extensive procedural safeguards, reflects a clear commitment to protecting the educational rights of children with disabilities. Shifting the burden of proof to parents

---

[4] NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL, ENGAGING SCHOOLS: FOSTERING HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' MOTIVATION TO LEARN 217–18 (2004).

[5] ADVOCATES FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH, ISSUE BRIEF: SCHOOL SUSPENSION: EFFECTS AND ALTERNATIVES 2 (2006), http://www.soros.org/initiatives/baltimore/articles_publications/articles/issue_20060418/ issuebrief_20060418.pdf.

[6] TABY ALI & ALEXANDRA DUFRESNE, MISSING OUT: SUSPENDING STUDENTS FROM CONNECTICUT SCHOOLS 4 (Aug. 2008), *available at* http://www.ctkidslink.org/publications/edu08missingout.pdf.

[7] CONN. AGENCY REGS. § 10-76h-14 provides that in special education due process hearings, "*the public agency* has the burden of proving the appropriateness of the child's program or placement, or of the program or placement proposed by the public agency" (emphasis added).

[8] *See, e.g.*, DEL. CODE. ANN. tit. 14, § 3140 (West 2009); D.C. MUN. REGS. tit. 5, § 3030.3 (West 2009); N.J. STAT. ANN. § 18A:46-1.1 (West 2009).

[9] Elissa Gootman, *Special Education Ruling's Effects Unclear*, N.Y. TIMES, Nov. 17, 2005, at A28.

[10] Circular Letter, Series 2005-06, C-9 (Feb. 22, 2006) (noting that Connecticut's burden of proof regulation represents "a valid state policy that school districts are in a better position to defend the appropriateness of an IEP").

[11] *Joint Committee on Education Public Hearing* (Feb. 20, 2007) (statement of Catherine Holahan, Attorney); *Joint Committee on Education Public Hearing* (Feb. 20, 2007) (statement of Maria Morelli-Wolfe & Lynn Cochrane, Attorneys); *Joint Committee on Education Public Hearing* (Feb. 20, 2007) (statement of James D. McGaughey, Executive Director, Office of Protection and Advocacy for Persons with Disabilities).

[12] Schaffer v. Weast, 546 U.S. 49, 65 (2005) (Ginsburg, J., dissenting).

[13] 20 U.S.C. § 1400(c)(2).

[14] 34 C.F.R. § 300.11; CONN. AGENCY REGS. § 10-76d-6.

who challenge the adequacy of their child's educational program unfairly forces them to assume the role of IDEA-enforcer; a role that is contrary to IDEA's strong policy statement in favor of holding districts legally responsible for implementing and monitoring the provision of special education services to all eligible students, and one that parents are ill-equipped to handle.

b. <u>Allocating the Burden of Proof to School Districts Holds them Accountable for Complying with IDEA</u>

When a dispute arises regarding the adequacy of the child's IEP, the school district is in the best position to demonstrate that it has complied with federal law. An overwhelming majority of parents whose children are eligible for special education services lack the sophistication and specialized training necessary to challenge the design and implementation of their child's IEP.[15] Given the complex nature of special education law, and the availability of numerous interventions and alternative programs for children struggling to access the curriculum, parents face significant barriers to proving that the district has denied their child a free, appropriate education. By contrast, local school districts can draw on a wealth of expertise and training, as well as their experiences with other disabled children, to demonstrate the appropriateness of a child's academic plan and their compliance with IDEA.[16] Allocating the burden of proof to school districts simply adds an important dimension of accountability and an additional guarantee that all students, regardless of their cognitive or behavioral deficits, have an equal chance at academic success. We urge you to protect the rights of special education students by opposing this section of the bill.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Hannah Benton
Attorney/Equal Justice America Fellow
Truancy Court Prevention Project

Carmia Caesar
Attorney
Director of TeamChild Juvenile Justice Project

Justin Taylor
Law Student Intern

[15] David M. Engel, *Law, Culture, and Children with Disabilities: Educational Rights and the Construction of Difference*, 1991 DUKE L.J. 166, 187–94 (1991).
[16] Oberti v. Bd. of Educ. of Borough of Celmenton Sch. Dist., 995 F.2d 1204, 1219 (3d Cir. 1993).